THEOLOGY

VOL. LV JANUARY, 1952 No. 379

Editorial

THE result of the General Election disclosed that there is at present a state of political equilibrium between the two parties, so that the issue is decided by a small transfer of votes in a few marginal seats. There is much less of a "floating vote" than there has been in the past. This is not a satisfactory state of affairs. It means that we get governments without an easy or working majority in a period when we need governments that are free to concentrate on the weightiest matters and to govern with decision and strength, instead of being distracted by tiresome tactical necessities. Moreover, it is bad also for the defeated party. It does a party good to be soundly beaten and to be made to realize that it must do some radical rethinking of its philosophy, its policy, and its program. Both parties might now profit from a defeat of that kind. A merely marginal defeat encourages a party to suppose that it will easily float into power again before long as a result of the tide that always tends to flow against the Administration in office.

There is no obvious way in which this equilibrium is likely to be upset. The best way in which it could be upset would be by the emergence in either or both of the parties of a fresh political creed better matched to the times and with the drive of a new conviction behind it. This will not be easy, on account of the present strength of party discipline, not to mention the perennial reluctance of Englishmen to think fresh thoughts.[1] The Christians in both parties should be more free than some others to start the ferment that is needed. Though they can be loyal and realistic members of their party, they cannot be good party men in the bad sense of the word, since their allegiance to party can never be more than relative. They know how fallible men are, especially when organized in self-righteous groups. They have in their Christian faith a constant stimulus to the re-examination of their assumptions, their aims, and their motives. They need neither over-estimate nor under-estimate the importance of what they are in a position to do. And they should be equipped with the courage to follow an unpopular course.

* * * * *

A priest from the West Indies told us recently of a striking experience that he had when appointed to a large cure of souls there a good many years ago. He found that church life in the parish had

[1] Karl Mannheim's posthumous work, *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 25s.), will be found to provide plenty of food for fresh thought. The editors' introduction to this book should be skipped.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

become very slack, and the church was able to continue financially only because a prosperous business firm handsomely supported it. The new Rector realized at once that this made him much too dependent on a single interest, and that it was thoroughly bad for the people as a whole. He knew that his parishioners attached great importance to burial in consecrated ground, i.e. in the churchyard, and would be horrified at the prospect of having to be buried in the public cemetery, which was unconsecrated and commonly known as the "cattle cemetery". He therefore announced one Sunday that from then onwards no one whose church dues were not paid up would be buried in the church's graveyard—with the exception of registered paupers. On the very next day a prominent white citizen, who had been a notorious unbeliever, though his mother was a devoted churchwoman, died suddenly. His mother naturally wanted him to be buried in the church's graveyard, and no doubt everyone expected that he would be. The Rector, however, decided to stick to his guns, though he knew that by doing so he might irretrievably alienate the bulk of his parishioners. The result was exactly the opposite. On the next Sunday the churchwardens complained that they could not cope with the crowds of people who wanted to put themselves right with regard to the payment of their church dues, and for a period two clerks had to be specially employed and installed in an office to deal with the business. This was the beginning of an all-round revival and strengthening of church life in the parish. Not only was ample money available to put and to keep the church buildings and furnishings in excellent repair, but the people henceforth showed by their keenness that they valued the church and what it stood for as they had never done before.

We leave this true story to speak for itself, with only these two remarks—first, that its moral for the Church of England is not so plain as might be wished; secondly, that it would do a world of good to the parishioners of any parish in England to think out what its moral is.

Concerning "Rigorists"

A STUDENT of the history of theology soon learns to be careful about his use of terms. He knows that new words are coined from century to century to express new meanings and to define new experiences. And terms change their meaning; they fall into disuse and are sometimes revived with a new shade of meaning, which can be confusing. The term "evangelical", for instance, first used to denote those who stood in the direct succession of the "enthusiasts", has in the twentieth century acquired an inclusiveness which would have shocked and dismayed Wesley, Whitefield, or Simeon. We are watching the reintroduction into current theological diction of the term "ecumenical" in a sense in which it has never been used in theology before, and in which it could never have been used, e.g. of the

Council of Constantinople. A new arrival on the scene is the term "rigorist", noun or adjective, which would merit the most careful attention. It is being repeatedly used in all kinds of theological discussion and writing, and it is time that somebody attempted a definition of it, for it has most surely arrived.

A term of this description can be defined in many different ways: in relation to its opposite, by reference to its historical context, in terms of its theological meaning, in relation to the practices it represents, and in relation to the convictions which give rise to it. The search for an opposite in this case would not be easy, for the reason that those who are styled "rigorists" at the present have not yet coined a word for their detractors. The only terms which history might provide would be "liberal" or "latitudinarian", the one from philosophy and the other from the history of church polity. But neither would be satisfactory, inasmuch as both terms gained their place in the theological vocabulary in circumstances other than those which have given rise to the word "rigorist". The historical context in which the word has been born is roughly as follows. The twentieth century in England has witnessed a decline in religious conviction and practice which is without parallel for at least two hundred years. This has given rise to serious problems in the administration of church discipline. There is still a large portion of the population who, while having withdrawn all apparent co-operation with the Church, and who claim the right to think, behave, and worship as they please, yet require the ministrations of the Church at baptisms, marriages, and burials. Clerical opinion is fast dividing as to the best method of dealing with this crisis which has been forced upon the Church. General conservative opinion, which in bad days is always in the majority, favours a policy of "appeasement". This may arise either from genuine conviction that it represents God's will in the matter, or else from lack of the ingenuity or courage to do otherwise. The people's desire to have the ministrations of the Church, they would say, is to be taken for what it is worth, made the best of, and is then to be left to the consciences of those concerned and to the inscrutable providence of God. Any attempt to tidy up the administration of these things is to be discouraged, as being liable to alienate the sympathies of those concerned and so to render more difficult their eventual conversion. A blind eye is to be turned to the theological and ecclesiastical difficulties involved. The opposite point of view, which is being increasingly held throughout the Church, is being described as "rigorist". The "rigorist" maintains that this habit of "appeasement" is not only dishonest and wrong in principle, but is in fact practically unwise. It deceives the population into thinking that the Church is satisfied with them; it obliterates the distinction between the Church and the world; it makes nonsense of the idea of the divine body of Christ, and it postpones indefinitely the possibility of conversions. This school of thought recommends that these occasional offices and sacraments should be administered only to those who are in some recognizable way members of the Church, and that those who have ceased to worship with

336361

the Church, or who have never done so, and are not willing to begin doing so, should celebrate their vital crises under secular auspices.

It should be noted that the term "rigorist" is depreciatory. When pressed to a conclusion it can be insulting. The underlying idea of it is that those of whom it is used are more concerned with the rigours of the law than with the alleged "freedom" of the gospel. The "rigorist" is more concerned with outward conformity to the Church's discipline than with the loving spirit which made the Saviour of the world die upon the cross for all men. In short, this oppobrious title attempts to put the "rigorists" in the direct succession of the scribes and Pharisees, than which there is no greater theological opprobrium. This charge the "rigorists" would be well advised to consider and to answer. They might first take heart from a consideration of their antecedents in history. The terms "Puritan", "Enthusiast", "Ritualist", all really had this same charge behind them. It is a recurrent device of the worldly Church to belittle those who try to reform it by trying to trace their ancestry back to Christ's enemies in the gospel story. A cynical church historian once said that there seem to be three symptoms by which the promptings of the Holy Ghost to the Church of England can be surely recognized. One is that they must originate in some form from the University of Oxford; another, that they must be given a rude name; and the third that, at least in the early stages, they must command the opposition of a majority of the episcopal bench. Be that as it may, the "rigorist" need not be too dismayed by the nomenclature, nor by the attempts to trace his lineage to the Pharisees. For he has strong theological arguments to which he can have recourse, and many Biblical precedents. This whole contention resolves itself, as so many strivings in the past have done, to an argument about the nature of the Church. The "rigorist" appeals to the New Testament for his support. The Church is there delineated as a kingdom and as an army. A kingdom has its laws and an army its dicipline. A sheepfold is a thing with fences; it is the robber who "climbeth up some other way". He reads that "strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life"; and so on. If he tries to model the earthly church on what he reads in Holy Scripture about the Kingdom he can hardly be accused of Pharisaism on those grounds alone. As for his conception of the pastoral ministry, he finds that in the picture of the Good Shepherd, whose business it is both to tend the sheep and to keep off wolves and robbers. Robbers are presumably those who wish to take possession of the fold for their own purposes. The "rigorist's" position, therefore, whether his judgment be right or wrong, is an honest attempt to get back to what he believes to be the spirit of the gospels, and to make sense of the tension he finds there between the Church and the world. It is generally contended by the critics of the "rigorists" that Christ went about showing compassion on the multitude as on sheep having no shepherd, and that the Christian minister should therefore be at great pains to welcome all into the flock on almost any terms, if by any chance he may save some. And who is the individual minister, that he should set himself up as a judge, any-

way? To the first of these contentions the "rigorist" will reply that the minister must indeed sweep the highways and the byways, but he must not overlook the wedding garment nor the cleansing of the Temple. For his authority the "rigorist" looks, *inter alia*, to Christ's commission to the Apostles at Easter, which he believes has been handed on to the modern church. It is part of the function of the Christian minister to be a keeper of the door, to discriminate, to let in or to exclude, provided the criterion be Christ's own. The opposite conception, of the affable minister always ready to put anyone whatever through the searching demands of the sacraments, he finds contemptible and blasphemous. This practice may win the smiles, but deserves the contempt, of all reasonable men. The "rigorist's" conception of his ministry is thus the encouragement of all men within his reach to enter into the Church by the gate of conversion and baptism. It is his business to see that there is a welcome for all who take this step, or who are really contemplating it *bona fide*, and to make the Church as it is worthy to receive those who wish to become fellow-travellers within it. But to do this well, to do it at all in present circumstances, he must be prepared from time to time to refuse or cast out the hypocrite. His Lord, who did not scruple to cleanse the temple with a whip of cords (a most "unchristian" thing to do), and the Apostle who delivered Hymenaeus and Alexander over to Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme, would be his precedents in this matter.

It is not intended here to pursue these issues to a conclusion, but only to seek out the differentiae of the "rigorist". He is not, therefore, rightly described as one who is mainly or only concerned with legal formalities and the niceties of the Canon Law. He is one who believes solidly in the reality of the visible church into which entry is effected, by God's law, through conversion and penitence and baptism rightly received. Sacraments for him are sacraments not of the world but of the Church. The indiscriminate administration of them, therefore, as by a state department of religion, he considers to be a blasphemous parody of the real thing. And for his authority he goes back, not to Councils and traditions of Church Law, but to what he conceives to be the pure interpretation of the word of God in the two testaments of the Bible. That at least is his belief, even if it be proved to be mistaken. The appellation "rigorist" is therefore unjust and misleading.

It would be of interest here to summarize what in fact the "rigorist" is trying to do. He has received his uncomplimentary title mainly in virtue of his method of administering Baptism, Marriage, Burial of the Dead, and certain other occasional functions. In Baptism he is constantly accused of wishing to "fence the font". His enemies will ask him if Christ did not say "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not". These issues have been argued at length in these pages, and need not be repeated. But it must be pointed out that the "rigorist's" main difficulty here is a spiritual and conscientious one, and is not primarily concerned with law. He is offended at the scandal of the lapsed and the unbeliever

being allowed to take the searching sponsors' oaths, which are identical with those of Confirmation. He believes that the prevailing policy of "appeasement" is actually responsible for preventing the coming of the children to Christ, for under its terms the Church behaves to all as if they had come already. So far from being a "formalist" he is appealing away from formalism, as so many would-be religious reformers have done, to the simple content of the Gospel. Accordingly he sees Baptism as a real sacrament of the Church, "a mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened . . . and also a sign of regeneration and new birth" (Art. 27). Rather than be a party to what he feels the prevailing prostitution of Baptism, he is forced into the position of believing that Baptism for Infants should be administered only in the most carefully guarded and most genuine circumstances.

As for Marriage, the issues are broadly the same. He senses a certain unreality in the idea that the Church, functioning again as if it were a state department of religion, should solemnize all marriages, quite irrespective of the religious status of the parties. He sees Christian marriage once again as a sacrament of the Church, rightly contracted only between those who are already in some recognizable sense grafted into the body of Christ (meaning by this something more than formal baptism in infancy). The adversaries of the "rigorist" will plead that preparation for marriage is an excellent pastoral opportunity that should not lightly be cast away. The report "Towards the conversion of England" exhorted the clergy to use this opportunity to the full, on the grounds that about-to-be-married couples are specially receptive of Christian indoctrination, and to use it for conversions. The "rigorist" is also a realist, and he would very much doubt if the three preoccupied weeks of which he is invited to take opportunity do in fact often offer openings for conversion. He is aware that in the average parish where the policy (if it can be termed such) of the "open door" is pursued a huge proportion of the couples indoctrinated at this point never appear again inside the church walls, except to demand some other rite or ministration for themselves or theirs. A majority of such applicants come from a background of apostasy or unbelief (very often both), which it is difficult or impossible to undo in one interview, or even three. What meaning, the "rigorist" would ask, can they attach to Christian marriage who have no real understanding of the Holy Ghost or the power of prayer, and no place in their lives for worship? He will most certainly "preach for conversion", with tenderness and with great searchings of the heart, but where it does not come (and can there be any doubt?) he will courteously recommend the register office. He will follow the precedent of the Apostle Paul in judging that if one party is a believer then his or her faith will hallow the unbeliever; but he will not be satisfied with vague promises to "come to Church after the marriage". There are those who will say of these principles that they will lose a great opportunity to the Church; that thousands who otherwise might preserve an attitude at least of goodwill and occasional conformity to the Church will go

away with a life-long hostility against her. That he will not deny, but he will offer the challenge of statistics to show that where this program of careful, tender and Christian discrimination is exercised, more rather than less do in fact come to see the reasonableness of it and do come to embrace the Christian life in its fullness. He will be prepared to suffer the indignation and resentment of those who are thus turned away, but he will take comfort from the thought that whenever the Christian gospel is faithfully presented as a challenge to a gainsaying generation it must always make enemies in this kind of way. He will come to look with contempt on those many parishes in which the pomps and ceremonies of the Church, the prized distinctions of the choir, organ, carpets, bells, etc., are to be bought with money by every apostate and unbeliever at will. The "rigorist" will be more inclined to award them only to those who have shown their love for their Lord by faithful witness, work, and worship in the life of the Church. It must be admitted that there is much justice and even more honesty of mind in such courses of action. The historian of the English Church in the future might well write up her administration of weddings in the twentieth century as one of her principal abuses, which the "rigorist" is at least trying to reform. If statistics were available, he would probably find that the number of Easter communicants at any given Church was in inverse proportion to the number of wedding on Easter Eve.

In the matter of the Burial of the Dead the "rigorist" is treading on very firm ground. The Prayer Book service clearly implies that the departed was in some sense a brother in the Christian community, that he will have departed in a humble and penitent frame of mind and in the sure and certain hope of the Resurrection in Christ. It is once again a service of the Church for her members (and her faithful continuing members at that). The free and unquestioning use of it over the bodies of all the departed is to him an intolerable abuse. His pastoral experience will have taught him the bitter and inescapable lesson that the majority of his parishioners, in these days, depart this life with little if any thought of penitence, and all too often in an orgy of self-satisfaction which is abhorrent to the Christian mind. As for a belief in the Resurrection in Christ and in the Judgment, he will have found them all too rare. But he will have diligently sought out the departing, and will at least have tried to induce in them a Christian frame of mind. Where that is so his course is clear and no difficulties arise. But when every indication of contemporary society shows only too clearly that the Christian background of death has dropped out of the thinking of Englishmen he will have severe scruples about reading the Prayer Book office at random over the whole population. He believes that this type of ministry (if it can be so termed at all) is deceptive and dangerous, ministering in fact to all the worst prejudices of this generation. All the dead, in their opinion, are sanctified, all citizens are regenerate, and there is no such thing as hell. Against this terrible apostasy he feels he must offer some protest, not only for the warning of the apostate, but for the encouragement of believers. In the case of

Burial there is as yet no parallel to the register office in marriage. The "rigorist" wonders whether there ought not to be a form of civil burial for those who have no real religion, or at least an alternate form of the Burial Service to be used by clergymen in the case of those who have ceased to be members of the Church. This need not be condemnatory, and could commend all the departed to the universal love of God in terms which do not imply that all the departed were faithful members of Christ's body the Church. Such a service could be shorter than the Prayer Book office, and so would be acceptable to the proprietors of those crematoria who have to despatch the departed at ten-minute intervals through a long and weary day. Readers might well give attention to a paper in THEOLOGY (May 1951, by the Rev. Eric Wild) on "The Pastoral and Evangelistic Opportunities of Funerals". The author there makes several recommendations for the better exploitation of these occasions, with which most people will have been in agreement. But there is an assumption at one point of the paper which bears on this argument, and which needs further examination. The writer states that "any rigorist approach to the occasional offices which has the effect of destroying these occasions of meeting should be resisted". There we have the anti-rigorist point of view in its baldest form, arbitrary, unexamined. Nothing further from the gospel approach to these problems could well be imagined. No word is to be spoken, no action taken, however right, which will alienate the population to whom we minister. The prophets from Elijah to Wesley might well take note. The writer of this paper assumes without argument that Christ's will in all such cases can be done only by giving to the people what will flatter and please them, and that no good can ever be done by resisting their will or antagonizing them. This shows up perhaps more clearly than anything else what the "rigorist" is trying to stand for. Believing as he does that it is the work of the true minister to declare God's will to the people "whether they will hear or whether they will forbear", he is not prepared to flatter and deceive a rebellious generation by behaving towards them as if all the departed were faithful servants of Christ. Their asking for Christian burial is indeed an opportunity for the priest to visit the people, which he should seize with both hands. But if the people know beforehand that no matter what was the manner of life of the departed the Christian burial rite will be granted him, then it makes little difference what the minister says, for his actions will belie his words. For they speak louder than words. And the teaching which they so liberally purvey is that "we are all going the same way" and there are no differentiae of the Christian life at all. The faithful minister will fulfil his commission in whatever terms he thinks appropriate. He will always err on the side of mercy, and he will often give the benefit of a doubt, but the occasion will often arise in which it will be his duty in Christ's name to say: "I am very sorry, but X has long ago left the Christian fellowship, and he has often refused my invitations to him to return, although he was a sworn member of it. I do not therefore feel that I can conscientiously perform over him a burial office

which implies that he was faithful in this matter at least. I will, if you like, improvise a general burial commendation of his soul to God, but that is the most I can honestly do." That is real evangelism, the plain declaration of God's word. It will meet with bitter antagonism, but so does the presentation of God's word in any age, in so far as the presentation of it is faithful. The "rigorist" knows that no good can come in the long run fom the present obsequiousness, but only confusion and unbelief. As long as the church continues to act on these occasions as a State burial agency, so long must the people be deceived and the days of conversion postponed. The "rigorist" seizes his opportunity and exploits it, not as a "man-pleaser", but in humble imitation of the Master and his Apostles, plainly rebuking hypocrisy where it is evident to him. For in his reading of the New Testament the "rigorist" does not see Christ as one who went about dispensing sympathy indiscriminately, but as one who "knew what was in men"; as one who said to this person, "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of Heaven", and to this, "Let the dead bury their dead". The prevailing interpretation of the Christian minister as a gullible, affable sacrament-monger has served the Church ill for three generations, through the period of her uninterrupted decline. The "rigorist" believes that all honest people would welcome a variation on this theme, and are prepared to applaud the Church when she stands up for her principles. Her enemies have always been those, inside the Church and without, who want to enjoy the Christian privileges on easy terms. Prophets and reformers have always been made of sterner stuff; they are not attractive personalities and have invariably met with bitter opposition. But they have been recognized by future generations as true bearers of the Word.

There is one other department of the Church's life in which the "rigorist" is beginning to show his uneasiness. One of the characteristic activities of the Church of England in the twentieth century is the habit of collecting together an assembly of the citizens of a district for services of a purely civic kind, and then behaving towards them as if they were the Church, all regenerate, all on the way of salvation, all too often using hymns and prayers which directly imply that such is the case. Nothing could be more deadening, more opposed to the true interests of evangelism. Sermons which imply that God makes the promises of the new covenant to nations as such, without reference to the rite of Baptism and the life of the international Church, all minister to the same baser prejudices of this generation, and send men away happy, contented, but impenitent. By the same token the "rigorist" would advocate the most careful redemption of these occasions, and the declaration of the word with true prophetic insight and courage, at any cost. Ecclesiastical statesmanship, he would say, is in this, as in so many other matters (not excepting the gospel scene itself), the real enemy of God's purposes.

Compliance in matters of religion will always win smiles and favour, and, quite often within the hierarchy of the Church, promotion. But the "rigorist" has his mind set on the proclamation of the word without let or favour. He humbly sees himself in the succession

of the reformers, and has often been surprised to read how he has been forced by circumstances unawares into a position similar to that of the great prophets of the eighteenth century. "The ministers of the established Church", said Charles Simeon, "are for the most part hirelings and sycophants, preaching and ministering not according to the will of God but at the pleasure of men, pretending to them that all are saved and justified, with no distinction." The Church of England has just suffered a grievous decline through what may yet be called the period of the three Scottish archbishops. There is some reason to believe that that period is not yet at an end. The "rigorist" believes most sincerely that he has a contribution to make to the arresting of this terrible decline. If the Church of England in England has a future (which should not be too easily assumed, for God putteth down one and setteth up another) it may yet prove to be that the key of the future lies with him. In those parishes where "rigorists" are at work there is a time of testing, but it looks as though their hopes are justified. For there is a fair-mindedness about the Englishman which makes him admire the Church when she acts according to her convictions in a forceful language which he can understand. For when the dust has settled and the "rigorist" is dug in, he very often seems to be commanding a following and breeding a robuster type of churchman who will gainsay the gossip of the pubs and clubs and vindicate the gospel of him who cleansed the Temple. It is worthy of note that the French revival associated with the name of the Abbé Michonneau has felt obliged to adopt a "rigorist" policy as over against the laxity of the Roman Church in France. This is in striking contrast to the practice of the highly successful Roman Church in Britain, which is "rigorist" to a man.

Such, then, is the "rigorist". Students of contemporary church history would do well to get acquainted with him, for he has come to stay. He should not, in all fairness, be regarded as a neo-pharisee and dismissed without a word. His protest is not against the spirit on behalf of the letter, but against formalism on behalf of the spirit. And he often does what he does out of a fresh study of Chist's word. He believes that feebleness and compromise beget no victories, and that the Church was founded not on butter but on the Rock. So before the inverted commas drop away and the Rigorist is honoured in the history books with a capital "R", all serious Christians might well consider whether he has not a message for this untoward generation.

B. C. Pawley.

Reflections upon *English Life and Leisure*

The publication last year of the book *English Life and Leisure*, by B. Seebohm Rowntree and G. R. Lavers, has created a distinct stir, comparable to, but not as great as, that caused in the U.S.A. by the publication of the *Kinsey Report*. *English Life and Leisure* contains material from which morals can obviously be drawn by those who are concerned with the Christian faith in this land, and indeed

the authors do a certain amount of moral-drawing themselves. The following brief and rather impressionistic observations will assume that the reader is acquainted with the book, or its outlines, already.

It is clear first of all that we must distinguish between the facts presented by the book and the author's interpretation of them. There can be no doubt of the sincerity of the authors in their approach to the discussion of religious topics, nor of their goodwill; they cannot even be described as trying to take an objective attitude; they are in a general sense warmly in favour of Christianity. But their ideas of what the right sort of Christianity is strike one as muddled, and one can only conclude from some of their remarks that their direct and firsthand contact with organized Christianity must have been greatly restricted. In their account of how the various denominations are facing the modern indifference to religion, for instance, they give strong approbation to the methods and organization of the Roman Catholic Church, and they quote as an example (p. 350) a certain Father X whose congregations far exceed, and whose pastoral energy seems to put in the shade, those of his clerical brethren in other denominations. They tell us that Father X has 1,200 parishioners and is assisted by two curates, but they do not seem to realize that this makes comparisons between his activity and that of his Anglican counterparts wholly unrealistic; comparisons such as these can produce only a grim smile in priests such as myself who have to look after 2,500 people without the slightest hope of a single curate, and would hardly produce even a smile among the very many Anglican priests who have to minister to far greater numbers with as little hope of help. But in spite of their admiration for the methods of the Roman Church, Mr Rowntree and Mr Lavers suggest in their chapter on Religion that the organized church in any denomination can no longer hope to appeal to the lapsed masses unless it simplifies its dogma and reduces its clericalism, and they commend the efficiency and vitality evident in the organizations attached to the various Free Church denominations. This is hardly consistent with the fact that the denomination most irretrievably committed to clericalism and dogma is the Roman Catholic, and that whenever they quote statistics suggesting how far the younger generation will support the various Christian denominations, these point regularly to the likelihood of the Free Churches losing in numbers, the Church of England remaining steady, and Roman Catholics gaining. In any case the differences between the figures for gains and losses in any denomination are not nearly large enough to justify the conclusion that any one of them is going to sweep the country, and in the melancholy list of Case Histories which forms the first and most valuable part of the book, lapsed Roman Catholics appear about as often as lapsed members of other communions.

Mr Rowntree and Mr Lavers also suggest that one cause of the lapse from religion in England may be the defective education of the non-Roman clergy, and by this they do not apparently mean that the clergy have not received sufficient technical training for doing their job efficiently, but that in many cases their general education is so

much below the level of that of many of their parishioners as to expose them to contempt and render them unable to win their people's respect; and they contrast with this defective education the very thorough education which their white-headed boy Father X has received. Now, I believe that particular suggestion, though well-meant, is completely unfounded. The level of the general education of the clergy undoubtedly has dropped in the last thirty years, and is likely to drop further in the next fifty, but it still is very far above that of the average member of the Church of England, even, I would maintain, in parishes including "residential areas". My own experience is that I have constantly to resist the temptation to feel that I have been educated right out of reach of my flock. One wonders very much how far the authors really have examined the education which most of the men who have been ordained today have received, whether, for instance, they have even seen a G.O.E. paper. One even wonders what the average Roman priest would do were he confronted with the General Ordination Examination.

It is, however, a very barren proceeding merely to point out the inadequacy of the conclusions drawn from their facts by the authors of this book. It is the picture of the religious condition of the English people presented in the Case Histories which is for our purpose the most important part of the whole study. We may with confidence take this picture as a representative one, so far as that is possible. In reading these Case Histories one is inclined to wonder whether the investigators asked the right questions; for instance, to ask the average Englishman the direct question "Are you religious?" (which apparently was done in at least some of the cases) is to invite embarrassed denial; but this is quite the wrong way to discover whether he really is religious. Still, we cannot seriously doubt the general accuracy of the picture presented, and it provokes several reflections which the clergy of the Church of England would do well to consider.

1. There is no convincing sign of a spiritual hunger in the minds of the people of England. There are no solid indications that a religious revival is just round the corner. Most people do not want the doctrines of the Church; but then most people do not want the doctrines of Karl Marx either. They simply want to be left alone to consume their beer, to have their little gamble, and (one must reluctantly add) to indulge in frequent adultery and fornication. It seems to me that to say that such a situation demands that we must modify our dogma to suit the minds of people who will otherwise have nothing to do with it is absurd. The difficulty is not conscious and thought-out rejection, but slothful muddle and confident ignorance. If a survey were to be taken of the views of the people of England upon the effectiveness and value of the British Army, it would certainly be found that vast numbers of people actively dislike the idea of serving in it and were ready to criticize freely its methods, policies, and *raison d'être*, and that even more were quite indifferent to it. But that would not be a very convincing reason for reforming it according to popular ideas. Even the wistful agnostics encountered

in these Case Histories are, one suspects, quite unaware of the real claims and arguments of the faith which they reject. It would be folly to base a simplification of dogma upon the criticisms of those who are admittedly almost completely ignorant of it.

2. There are, however, certain failures attributed to the Church in these Case Histories which are to some extent obviously present. Many of those interviewed seemed to think that the doctrine preached by the modern parson was usually either dreary moralism or impractical idealism. That moralism still is the besetting sin of the British sermon cries aloud to us anew every week from the *Wayside Pulpit*, an organ which weekly distributes over our country sentiments with which Confucius would have readily associated himself and slogans of which Seneca would have gladly approved, having no particular connexion with the Christian faith. And we cannot plead innocent of the charge of futile idealism once we consider how often the modern sermon depends upon what might be called "the If Utopian" ("If only the statesmen of the world would put the Sermon on the Mount into practice . . . If we could place Christians in all the key positions in industry . . . If the mothers of this country would unite for peace . . ."). Again, it is clear from these records that the Church of England (noticeably more than the Free Churches) still harbours a certain amount of purely conventional Christianity, even among its churchgoers. Several of those interviewed admitted that their religion was purely conventional, and these were almost all Anglicans. The "anticlericalism" manifested by many of those interviewed is a noteworthy fact too. It seems to me that the main cause of this is not that the clergy have within the last fifty years become lazy, hypocritical and officious, but that in the last fifty years they have ceased to visit their flocks. By "visiting" I do not mean putting up a notice in the church porch inviting anyone who wants a visit to say so (surely the flimsiest way of quieting one's conscience on the subject); nor do I mean visiting only the sick, those who are in trouble, and the churchgoers. I mean visiting the house of every single person in the parish, regularly and resolutely, as an inescapable pastoral obligation, even though it takes ten years to complete the task. Contact with a concrete example of "that fearful and bloody animal the English parson" is the surest way of dispelling such "anticlericalism".

3. It certainly does seem an inescapable conclusion from these records that the normal apparatus of parochial work is entirely ineffective for reaching the indifferent masses who live in the parishes and round the churches, but take no notice of either. If the clergy are to devote most of their attention in future simply to keeping the parochial and diocesan machine running as they do at the moment, then the masses will quite certainly remain indifferent. One cannot help being struck also, as one reads these Case Histories, with the futility of the policy pursued by the great majority of churches of all denominations of regarding their fellow-Christians in other denominations as brothers in theory, but completely ignoring their activity in fact. If the principle of comity can be agreed upon and

observed faithfully in the mission field, there is no final reason why it should not be applied to many parts of England today, where clergy are very few and there are large numbers of virtually unevangelized men and women. To have a new housing estate, for instance, enjoy the full-time ministration of a Methodist, Congregationalist, or Presbyterian, rather than to expect all of these men together with an Anglican priest to give to it part of their time, already very busily employed elsewhere, would, I confess, seem to me worth risking the possibility that the inhabitants of the estate might not be taught a full appreciation of the benefits of a fixed liturgy and of the Apostolic Succession.

4. Last of all, we must not leap to the conclusion that religion has no effect at all in this land. It would be as mistaken to conclude from these Histories that religion is dead in England as to conclude that there is a religious revival just around the corner. Every now and then, in the dreary record of people who have no use for religion and very little for morals, there occurs a case,

> Bright as a star, when only one
> Is shining in the sky,

of some man or woman who *is* a convinced Christian, whose faith is unmistakably sincere and who is obviously impressing the indifferent world around. These persons are both clergy and laity, and occur in all denominations. There is no doubt whatever that people can be converted in England today and are being converted.

This, I think, should give us the main lesson to be learned from the Case Histories in this book. People must be converted, thoroughly and individually converted. It is no use relying on a vague general hunger for religion or a vague general sympathy with the Church. And convention is a dangerous thing to rely on, either the convention, where it exists, of going to church, or the convention of having babies baptized. The Church must try to make itself more obviously different from the world; it is clear, indeed, that many of the indifferent are surprised and even a little annoyed that the Church is not more different. This is a task peculiarly difficult for the established Church of England, and better accomplished by the Roman Catholics pehaps than by any other major denomination. Perhaps a really drastic policy in the matter of administering Baptism might help here, but it would need much more concerted effort among parishes, and more agreement on principles among the clergy, than it has received hitherto. In any case, this book is a warning to the clergy of the Church of England that the conscientious carrying out of parochial routine, engrossing of time, energy, and interest though this may be, is not enough. They must lift up their heads above the parish. They must reconsider the fundamentals of their calling and their Gospel; and they must (preferably to my mind, in co-operation with their Free Church brethren) devote more time and more energy to direct, individual conversion of the indifferent.

R. P. C. Hanson.

Great Preachers—XI. Mark Frank

I. Mark Frank, a great Caroline preacher famous in his day, has undeservedly passed almost into oblivion. He is described by W. Fraser Mitchell, in his *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson*, as "the fairest star in the constellation of the 'witty' preachers. His Course of Sermons, which appeared in 1672" (preserved in two volumes of the Anglo-Catholic Library), "is the high-star of Anglo-Catholic preaching".

This is praise indeed! Does he deserve so high a place amongst English preachers?

Born in 1613 at Brickhill, Buckinghamshire, he entered Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, at the age of fourteen, becoming a Fellow in 1634. His sermon before the Lord Mayor and London's civic authorities in that year won Charles I's approval by its appeal for more loyal obedience to Bible and king. Already Puritanism was fiercely seeking ascendancy in Church matters. Cambridge University, with its High Church poets like Crashaw and Joseph Beaumont and its Laudian divines, was considered by the neighbouring Puritan counties as "a nest of vermin". In 1643, three weeks before Laud's murder, a Puritan Commissioner and soldiers destroyed the gold statues and the stained-glass windows of Peterhouse Chapel. Six months later the Earl of Manchester and his two Puritan chaplains confronted "malignant" members of the university, demanding their subscription to the Solemn League and Covenant under pain of losing their offices and of leaving Cambridge within three days of refusal. Mark Frank, with his Master and many devout and learned men, chose exile.

At the Restoration Frank, restored to his college fellowship, received other awards for his loyalty, becoming successively Archdeacon of St Albans, Treasurer and Prebendary of St Paul's, and Master of Pembroke. He died in 1664.

II. The seventeenth century is called the Golden Age of English preaching for its galaxy of famous preachers from Andrewes to Tillotson, for the tremendous interest paid to sermons by every rank and calling, and also for its gradual transformation of English discourses from medieval and Renaissance oratorical methods into something like modern sermons.

The century opened with "witty" or metaphysical preaching, of which Bishop Andrewes at King James's Court was the leading exponent. The defects of its erudite and complicated style paved the way through Donne to the more intelligible style of Jeremy Taylor and good parish priests like George Herbert; and thence to the Puritan preaching which paid little attention to dogmatic teaching and eschewed all ornament or quotation from the ancient classics or the Church Fathers, preferring to lard discourses abundantly with Scriptural quotations. This produced a jejune dullness which, with the continuous simplifying of English speech, led to the polished but hardly Christian sermons of the South and Tillotson type.

Mark Frank's place lies in the transitional period from the "witty" sermon to a clearer and more intelligible exposition of Catholic truth. He owes much to Andrewes, is more dogmatic than Donne, and has the fire which derives from passionate regard for the Incarnation and the Passion—a fervour impossible for Puritan divines who largely disregarded Church festivals and tried to make Christmas Day a fast-day. W. F. Mitchell says, "For the Puritan the greatest miracle in the Universe was not the incarnation and passion of the Saviour, but that God should have elected him 'before all worlds' to 'sit with Christ in heavenly places', as one of the 'saints' to judge the rest of mankind."[1]

"Witty" preaching, of which Frank was a follower and reformer, did not mean *humorous* oratory. The metaphysical preachers accounted the Catholic faith worthy to be expounded and illustrated by all the "wit" or knowledge which the preacher could possess or gather from any source whatever. First, Scripture had pride of place. No Scripture text, or syllable even, but had its glory of exposition. To enhance its meaning, frequent quotations from Latin, Greek and Hebrew might be brought into play. All "secular" knowledge belonged to God, and might be impressed to his glory. Ancient or medieval tales, tit-bits of medical knowledge, the wonders and secrets of Nature, as seen even in old-time quaint bestiaries—all these, and anything else which might kindle interest and attention in the hearer, might be used and stressed, if so be the Gospel might be more richly preached.

Lancelot Andrewes *could* preach colloquially and tenderly; but his "witty conceits" or play with words (which a Scotch courtier compared with a juggler's tossing of balls[2]), his compressed style, making his discourses rather like lecture notes, dogmatic, unsentimental, make his sermons difficult reading today.

Some excuse might be made for the learned quotations and similes of such preachers, since they preached chiefly to educated people. Even tradesmen's sons (who consorted with gentry's sons in the local grammar schools) were accustomed to share in school disputations based upon the study of Latin orators and historians.[3] Yet we cannot but sympathize with Puritan complaints in the matter, and in some measure with Sir James Stephen's charge that the Tudor and Stuart Church lamentably failed to preach for artisans and labourers.[4]

III. Mark Frank, thirteen years old when Andrewes died, became a Catholic theologian of the Andrewes and Laudian school. By the time he was first preaching at Cambridge (1634–43) he had ample time to consider Puritan grumbling against too learned and complicated a style in the pulpit. He saw the danger of self-display. His sermons shunned controversy, and, as we have seen, glow with the warmth which the Incarnation and its implications enthuse in the humble and instructed Catholic.

[1] See Mitchell, pp. 258, 259.
[2] John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*.
[3] W. F. Mitchell, pp. 76–90.
[4] *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography* (Essay on Rd Baxter).

He stands by himself as a preacher. He avoids the endless digressions and lengthy quotations of Donne and Jeremy Taylor. His few words of Latin or Greek quotations are taken from the Vulgate or Greek Testament of the day's Church lections. He shows great desire to reach all classes of hearer, making his sermons, though learned, intelligible to the ordinary churchgoer. Indeed, his only trace of monotony is his insistence, oft repeated, that *all* may show devotion to our Lord, serve and obey him.

He eschews moreover the contemporary fashion of over-lengthy sermons. Donne's *Death's Duel* must have taken a full hour to deliver, Taylor's *Wedding Ring* (if preached as printed) two hours; Frank's sermons keep a steady average of about thirty-five minutes. For that toleration Puritans probably called him a "dumb dog".

Like Andrewes, he is prone to "crumble texts" (to use George Herbert's words[1])—that is, expound each phrase or word; but his crumbling is pardonable, because always lucid and helpful.

IV. A précis of his well-known Christmas Day sermon on Mary swaddling her Infant Son may serve to illustrate his methods.

Text: Luke 2. 7: *And she brought forth her first-born Son, and wrapped him in swaddling-clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn.*

(He begins with this eloquent passage:)

i. "I shall not need to tell you who this 'she', or who this 'him'. The day rises with it in its wings. This day wrote it with the first ray of the morning sun upon the posts of the world. The angels sung it in their choirs, the morning stars together in their courses. The Virgin Mother, the Eternal Son. The most blessed among women, the fairest of the sons of men. The woman clothed with the sun: the sun compassed with a woman. She the gate of heaven: he the King of glory that came forth. She the mother of the everlasting God: he God without a mother: God blessed for evermore. Great persons as ever met upon a day. . . . The great lesson for them both is to be little, to think and make little of ourselves; seeing the infinite greatness in this day become so little. Eternity a child, the rays of glory wrapt in rags, Heaven crowded into a corner of a stable, and he that is everywhere want a room.

"I may at other times have spoke great and glorious things both of the persons and the day: but I am determined to-day to know nothing but Jesus Christ in rags, but Jesus Christ in a manger."

Thus Frank sets forth his subject—"let us see what God hath sent us in it".

ii. The text sets forth seven plain steps of our Lord's humility in the Incarnation.

(1) His *birth of a human,* a woman;
(2) and *she a carpenter's wife.*
(3) He is *treated as a child, handled, wrapped up, bound.*
(4) *His clothes mere rags* (σπάργανον is a rag).

[1] "The Parson Preaching" in *A Priest to the Temple.*

"What ado we have about our apparel! this lace, & that trimming; this fashion, and that colour; these jewels, and those accoutrements; this cloth and that stuff . . . as if our whole life were raiment, our clothes heaven, and our salvation the handsome wearing them!"

(5) He *demands no cradle.*

"What, not a room among men, not among the meanest, in some smoky cottage, or ragged cellar; but among beasts? Whither hath thy humility driven thee, O Saviour of mankind? Why, mere pity of a woman in thy mother's state, O Lord, would have made the most abdurate have removed her from the horses' feet, the asses' heels, from the ordure and nastiness of a stable!"

(6) *The disrespect of men*—"no room for them in the inn"!

(7) All this humility *in such a time and place,* when the whole world was gathered to be taxed, the city filled from one end to another—to suffer scorn as "an outcast of the people".

iii. This, though "the first-born", with rights to the priesthood, the regal dignity, and a double portion—to be dishonoured till the clothes of both his manger and his grave are unwrapped at the Resurrection!

His Gospel kept a mystery: his doctrine hidden in parables: his grace covered in the sacraments: his universal Church in a few Jewish disciples. *Vere tu es Deus absconditus!*—born in a poor inn to proclaim our life a pilgrimage!

"What though there be no room for him in the inn? I hope there is in our houses for him. It is Christmas time, and let us keep open house for him; let his rags be our Christmas raiment, his manger our Christmas cheer, his stable our Christmas great chamber, hall, dining-room. We must clothe with him, and feed with him, and lodge with him at this feast. He is now ready by and by to give himself to eat; you may see him wrapped ready in the swaddling-clothes of his blessed sacrament; you may behold him laid upon the altar as in his manger. Do but make room for him, and we will bring him forth, and you shall look upon him, and handle him, and feed upon him: bring we only the rags of a rent and torn and contrite heart, the white linen cloths of pure intentions and honest affections to swathe him in, wrap him up fast, and lay him close to our souls and bosoms. It is a day of mysteries: it is a mysterious business we are about: Christ wrapped up, Christ in the sacrament, Christ in a mystery; let us be content to let it go so, believe, admire, and adore it. It is sufficient that we know Christ's swaddling clothes: his righteousness will keep us warmer than all our winter garments; his rags hold out more storms than our thickest clothes; let us put them on. His manger feeds us better than all the Asian delicacies, all the dainties of the world; let us feed our souls upon him. His stable is not hanged here with arras, or decked with gilded furniture; but

it is hung infinitely with gifts and graces: the stable is dark, but there is the light of the world to enlighten it."

What a model for preaching!—tinged throughout with mystical interpretation, not foolish or dreamy, but practical, wholly consonant with the nature of God and man—mercy and truth met together!

Here, as in all truly Catholic and evangelical preaching, the preacher opens out to his hearers a vista of the abiding verities found only in him who is the way to God—

> Ever and anon a trumpet sounds
> From the hid battlements of eternity;
> Those shaken mists a space unsettle, then
> Round the half-glimpséd turrets slowly wash again,
> But not ere him who summoneth
> I first have seen![1]

G. Lacey May.

American Letter: No. 11

A brief account of the "Chicago school of theology" may be of interest to readers in Britain. This is the name for a group of philosophical theologians whose work has been developed in the University of Chicago during the last quarter of a century, while its roots go back to the beginning of the century.[2] It constitutes in America a live option to the rapidly disappearing theological liberalism of the past fifty or seventy-five years. The position of the school is often described as "Neo-Naturalism", since its philosophical outlook is based on a rational-empirical methodology and on many of the principles and categories of process. In its more recent phases it has been largely influenced by A. N. Whitehead, whose books are, of course, well known in England. All that can be offered in this short letter is a summary indication of some of the Chicago school's theological emphases or orientations which result from its philosophical standpoint.

God's character or nature. It is believed that *what* God is, not merely *that* he is, may be a matter of empirical knowledge. This can best be described as that of a "sensitive nature". In referring to God's working Meland writes, "This is the operation, this tender, patient gracious working, too silent to be audible, too subtle to be obtrusive, too vast and extensive to be observed, of which religious sensitivity must make us aware." It should be kept in mind that "feeling"

---

[1] Francis Thompson, *The Hound of Heaven.*

[2] The following may be regarded as representative of the school: Henry N. Wieman—*Religious Experience and the Scientific Method, Normative Psychology of Religion* (with R. W. Wieman). *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth, Is There a God?* (with Macintosh and Otto, ed. by C. C. Morrison) and *The Source of Human Good*; Bernard E. Meland—*Modern Man's Worship, Seeds of Redemption,* and *The Reawakening of Christian Faith*; Daniel D. Williams—*God's Grace and Man's Hope* and various articles; and Bernard M. Loomer—various articles, mainly in *The Journal of Religion.* Mention should be made also of Charles Hartshorne of the University philosophy department.

is a key-word for Whitehead in describing man's experience, and one that is much used by the Chicago group to denote the religious response. It is a grave misundertanding to think that "feeling" is an exclusively emotional response. It includes emotion but much more. It is an aesthetic response. And Whitehead referred to God as the principle of aesthetic order.

Another pointer in the same direction is Meland's view that the theologian is a blend of "the poet and the metaphysician". As Jeans saw God as the Great Mathematician, we may infer the Chicago group sees God as the Poet-Metaphysician.

God as Cosmic Mind is specifically rejected. It is a mere "mechanism of adjustment" employed by the human and non-human alike. Mind can be evil and it can be trivial, so it is not adequate imagery. Likewise Moral Will is unsatisfactory as analogy or metaphor. "Moral will can be a ruthless operation, as it has been in human history. And a deity with moral will and nothing else can be intolerable" (Meland).

It is not without significance that, from Whitehead on, the emphases to be found in the description of the operation or function of God depreciate the notion of God as Creator in any ultimate sense and exalt the concept of the God who saves, redeems, etc. Although God is not *metaphysically* ultimate, he is religiously ultimate and sovereign.

Transcendence and Immanence.—A superficial reading of the neonaturalistic literature would lead to the opinion that it is only another form of "the religion of immanence". But, again, religiously or theologically speaking, God is regarded as *transcendent* as well as immanent in the process. Metaphysically there are no grounds for speaking of his transcendence, it is believed. In fact, such language involves one in the most complete ambiguity. There is always the tendency towards "falling into such crude and irrelevant conceptions as 'being spatially contained in', 'being outside of' " (Williams).

Transcendence and immanence are best understood as "unconditioned" and "conditioned"; and it is difficult, if not impossible, to escape from the view that our knowledge of the "unconditioned" always involves the "conditioned" and that the "conditioned" always has some element of the "unconditioned" (cp. Paul Tillich and William Temple).

"I deny that any traditional definition of transcendence—or, for that matter, of immanece—is unambiguous. According to current metaphysics every individual is immanent in and transcends all others, and the transcendence and immanence of God is the supreme case of this double relation" (Hartshorne).

"Immanental theology" ends by identifying God with some human tendency or characteristic, and we then succumb to the temptation to worship ourselves or to identify our plans and ideals with God's purpose. This is not only erroneous and dangerous to religion, but the underlying fallacy of "liberal" theology.

"The God who saves us is neither the wholly transcendent absolute, the unmoved mover, nor is he merely the inward working power

among other powers of the simple theology of immanence. He is what he is, in his own integrity, the everlasting source of all being and good, present in every moment of the world's life, determining it as fully as it can be determined in the light of the fact that out of his love he has set his creatures free, and will not destroy their freedom" (Williams).

But perhaps the real issue in the minds of the critics of a naturalistic theology is better expressed in other words, i.e. a seeming neglect of the discontinuities of experience, because there is an inevitable tendency toward continuity of explanation. Specifically, it is thought that naturalism does not do justice to that which is peculiarly human and especially to that which is fundamental from the standpoint of Christian faith: to man's freedom (and capacity to sin) and *a fortiori* to God as Spirit. It is true, of course, that there is a primary emphasis in the school of thought under consideration in the direction of "continuous patterns of structure" defined in terms of "categorical" elements that constitute the metaphysical system. But, within the total picture of those elements which all individuals participate in that they may exist at all, discontinuities are recognized. This problem is considered by Loomer, who writes in "Christian Faith and Process Philosophy," *Journal of Religion* (vol. xxix, p. 187), as follows:

"In answer to this objection, it should be admitted at once that there are discontinuities between the human and subhuman levels. There are discontinuities between all levels of existence, at least as seen by process philosophy. There are properties or qualities at any designated level of existence which apparently are characteristic of that level alone. A whole is more than the sum of its parts, and there are novel and emergent wholes. Furthermore, the parts of a whole at one level of existence are different from analogous parts, as they function at lower levels. When Whitehead attributes 'feeling' and 'mind' to the subhuman levels, he does not mean that they are the same as human feelings and human reason. Similarly, time and space cannot be completely the same for the subhuman as they are for us."

This is quite satisfactory so far as it goes. But the methodology of the group will not allow it to go on by inference to an appreciation of a radical discontinuity between the human, human values, etc., and God. No such discontinuity can be experienced, therefore it does not exist!

Revelation.—As one might surmise from previous sections of this discussion, revelation is the "general revelation" which underlies all "natural theology". The idea of "special" or "historical" revelation is not on the whole congenial to those within the neo-naturalistic school of thought. However, more recently there have been efforts to assimilate into the "system", or to adjust to, the traditional view of a special revelation. This may represent a trend.

Those whose position is closest to Whitehead, pure and undefiled, recognize but little validity in the concept of revelation as self-disclosure and are inclined to think of it in terms of "discovery". On the other hand, in more recent years there has been wider recognition

of revelation as being grounded in divine initiative rather than human search.

Revelation is mediated through and in events, of course. The being, nature, and purpose of God is discerned in terms of "feeling" or a mystical attitude toward the total life-process. This was indicated above.

As for the place of the Scriptures in this view, they are regarded as the classical literature of religious experience in the Christian tradition. To some, the Bible has come as a great and new discovery wherein may be found in metaphor, simile, parable, poetry, etc., profound insights into the activity of God and man's response. The Bible in an amazing way, if properly interpreted, corroborates the best of Whitehead!

Sin, Evil, and Redemption.—It is quite obvious that the "sweet reasonableness" and general optimism of the liberal gospel has long since departed from the halls of the Chicago campus. There is an open and recurrent emphasis on evil as a given fact in human experience and on man's capacity or tendency to sin. Precisely what is meant by sin is not a matter of general agreement. The views range from thinking of sin as ignorance, lack of perception, etc., through moral failure which obstructs the development of the spiritual life to rebellion against the gentle promptings of God. The concepts of "Wrath" and "Judgment" are by no means absent from the contemporary expositions of God's relation to man. There is an encouraging and refreshing sternness in this theology; and nothing sentimental or "wishy-washy" about it.

According to Williams "the divine strategy" of redemption "becomes real to us in four primary ways". The first is the destruction of evil; the second is "the transmutation of evil and loss into new good"; the third is God's forgiveness; and fourth is the preservation of "the previous values of life and personality in the 'perpetual perishing' of time and death".

To underline the conviction that the redemptive function of God is, if not primary, of equal importance with the creative, the following quotation is offered from Williams' discussion of "Liberalism" *versus* "Neo-orthodoxy": "Theologically speaking, what is wrong with both schools is that they have no place for God's redemptive work in human history. Liberalism . . . does not see the need for it. . . . Neo-orthodoxy recognizes the need for redemption; but has never made an adequate place for the real possibility of redemption as transformation of our human existence, hence it postpones redemption to another realm."

Jesus Christ.—The "doctrine" of the Incarnation may be most succinctly stated by Loomer: "One might say that the 'sacrifice' of God is somewhat metaphorical. It cannot mean that mercy is optional with God. Surely it cannot mean that the self-giving of God revealed in Jesus Christ consisted in God's becoming 'incarnate', as an act of condescension, as though God as he is in himself is a being who basically exists apart from the world of process (and thereby fundamentally transcends history) and who out of mercy became

immanent and took on human form. As a matter of fact, the doctrine of the incarnation is likewise metaphorical in nature. Surely it cannot mean that God was not always 'incarnate'. From the perspective of process philosophy, the Word never 'became' flesh; God never 'became' incarnate or embodied. The world always embodies this divine ordering and this creative process. To speak of God's becoming incarnate in a human person would mean that in Jesus Christ the basic and most intimate attributes of God and existence itself were revealed: the mercy and love of God. By faith in this love we are justified."

The life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ are interpreted by Wieman as the actualization and release of creative transformative power. "Let us not be misunderstood. The creative transformative power was not in the man Jesus, although it could not have occurred apart from him. Rather he was in it. It required many other things besides his own solitary self. It required the Hebrew heritage, the disciples with their peculiar capacity for this kind of responsiveness. . . . The creative power lay in the interaction taking place between these individuals. It transformed their minds, personalities, their appreciable world, and their communiy with one another and with all men. . . . But we must continue the Christian story. We have told of the life of Jesus. The death of Jesus is equally important. Indeed, it is indispensable for our salvation. So long as Jesus lived, the creative event was bound to limits and confined by obstructions which would have prevented it from bringing salvation to man. . . . What happened at the Resurrection was the breaking of these bounds, when issued the 'power of the Resurrection' about three days after the Crucifixion. When Jesus was crucified, his followers saw that he could never carry to fulfilment the mission of the Jewish people as they conceived it. . . . He was not the messiah they had expected, and, so far as they could see, he was no messiah at all. . . . After about the third day, however, when the numbness of the shock had worn away, something happened. The life-transforming creativity previously known only with Jesus began again to work in the fellowship of the disciples. It was risen from the dead. Since they had never experienced it except in association with Jesus, it seemed to them that the man Jesus himself was actually present, walking and talking with them. . . . But what rose from the dead was not the man Jesus; it was creative power. It was the living God that works in time. It was the Second Person of the Trinity. It was Christ the God, not Jesus the man."

Perhaps the critic will feel that although the foregoing is far removed from the disciples' own interpretation, as it most certainly is, nothing much more than this "humanistic" view can be expected in the light of the philosophical presuppositions involved. It is, however, the conviction of the present writer that "process" philosophy lends itself as readily, perhaps more so, to an "orthodox" theological treatment of the doctrine of the Christ as did the fourth- and fifth-century Greek philosophical categories.

Christianity.—Although the present representatives of the Chicago

view have escaped fom the abortive attempt of yesterday to establish the "essence of Christianity", there is still a marked tendency toward subjective selection of "the best" of Christianity. This is, of course, an exceedingly unhistorical approach. And being "unhistorical" there appears in this line of thought considerable ambiguity and tentativeness regarding the "finality" or uniqueness of Christianity. With some, at least at the moment, it would seem that the Gospel or the Christian faith is no more than "a particularized instance of the universal religious consciousness".

The view of Wieman is typical: "It is sometimes alleged by Christians that nowhere else in the history of the world has God been redemptively revealed save in Christ. Whether or not this is true is an empirical fact to be discovered by inquiry. Nothing is more difficult to establish than a negative statement asserting that nowhere at no time did something or other exist. . . . When the thing sought has the intimacy and profundity of revelation and faith, one is not likely to detect its presence in a tradition alien to his own, even when it is manifest to those who have inherited the other tradition. . . . Therefore it would seem to be unjustifiably dogmatic and arbitrary to say that only to Christianity is . . . redemption and salvation known. One can certainly say that for us, in our tradition, Christ alone is our salvation. . . . But to say that we alone have the saving faith of the world is not a warranted statement."

No attempt at a criticism of the view of the Chicago group will be attempted here. Its weaknesses are in many cases all too obvious. In the main the problems arise from the effort to erect a philosophy or the word of Man to the status of a true revelation or the Word of God. This is the danger of all "natural theology".

However, we may properly ask a few questions: Is history self-redeemable as seems to be implied? Is not God caught within an immanental "system" as truly as in the Hegelian world-view? Is there not here a danger of a concealed "psychologism" in the generalization of the concept of "feeling", even though such is specifically disavowed? It does not seem that the "process philosophy" approach leads inevitably to such difficulties. Accordingly, how much does the present view retain unconsciously the vestigial remains of the older "liberalism" and "subjective idealism"?

In a more positive fashion, we should applaud the really courageous and adventuresome enterprise, i.e. the reconstruction of theology in terms of a contemporary metaphysic and world-view. It was in this spirit that Thomas Aquinas attacked the pagan philososphy and science of his age and environment. Above all there is no denying to these contemporary thinkers the virtues of honesty, genuine humility, and commitment to an almost superhuman task. Their conclusions, tentative as they are, may not satisfy; not because of their complete falsity, but because they seem inadequate as serious explanations and interpretations of human experience.

Further developments can assuredly be expected; and they will be awaited with deep interest.

Alden Drew Kelley.

Studies in Texts

Acts 7. 46.—H : asked to find a habitation for the God of Jacob.

A.V., R.V., and Moffatt read "God" here without any indication that there is an alternative, namely "house"; Westcott and Hort read θεῷ with a note in the list of Suspected Readings that οἴκῳ is probably a primitive error; Souter reads θεῷ in the text and notes the alternative οἴκῳ; Nestle reads οἴκῳ in the text; Ropes reads οἴκῳ and remarks in a footnote that "it is generally considered to be so difficult that it must be considered a very ancient error"; two commentaries before me—the Westminster and the Century Bible—give no hint that there is an alternative to θεῷ. Yet the manuscript evidence in favour of οἴκῳ is overwhelming. It is found in Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Codex Bezae. My purpose in this note is to suggest that it is the correct reading and that the understanding of Stephen's speech requires it. It is, indeed, failure to understand Stephen's argument that has led to the almost universal substitution of θεῷ.

We must turn to 2 Sam. 7. David has it in mind to build a house for the ark of God. Nathan, after first encouraging the intention, returns with a message that God does not want a house. It is not for David to build God a house. On the contrary, God will build David a house (11 and 27). More than that, "I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them that they may dwell in their own place and be moved no more" (10). So David is to be given a house, a dynasty, and Israel is to be given a habitation. And that is the promise to which Stephen refers when he says, "David asked to find a habitation for the HOUSE of Israel". It may be objected that nowhere in 2 Sam. 7 nor in 1 Chron. 17 does David ask any such thing. But neither does he "ask" to build a habitation for God; he suggests his intention of doing so. Stephen has inserted the "asking". But David is certainly represented as praying and thanking God, and the subject of his praise is God's promise to give him a house and Israel a habitation.

Stephen's peroration, then—and it really is a peroration and not the last surviving passage of a truncated speech—runs as follows. David was much too wise to attempt to build God a house. The history of Israel showed that God was with Israel wherever they went. But David longed for the time when Israel might settle down and end its wanderings. God is not a God who can be thought of as tied to one place. But a people is. He sought for them a resting-place. But Solomon built him a house. Solomon committed the sin which David avoided. The Temple which you idolize, the Temple which you charge me with speaking against, was a blunder from the start. It has encouraged in you a policy of isolationism. I am commissioned with a Gospel for all creatures, and you Temple-minded people want to keep it to yourselves. The Temple is, and always has been, symbol of Israel's rejection of David's prayer for a habitation for Israel, from which Israel could go out to all the nations, and the acceptance of

Solomon's blunder of building a habitation for God, round which Israel sat in isolationism and selfishness.

F. C. Synge.

"Down Peacock's Feathers"

One of the most generous acts of my life was the presentation to my friend the Rev. D. R. Davies of "Down Peacock's Feathers" as the title for a book he was writing on the General Confession, though he put it to more fertile use than I could ever have done. I had got the title from the Homily, "Of the Misery of all Mankind"; the words come in the last sentence of the first part. The last two sentences read as follows: "Wherefore, good people, let us beware of such hypocrisy, vainglory, and justifying ourselves. Let us look upon our feet; and then down peacock's feathers, down proud heart, down vile clay, frail and brittle vessels."

Some time after Mr Davies' book had been published, more than one of its readers wrote to him and said they could not find the words "down peacock's feathers" in the Homily from which he claimed to be quoting. He forwarded the complaint to me and asked what explanation I could offer. Hitherto, I had consulted only the standard edition of the Homilies, which has been published by S.P.C.K. since 1864. I now proceeded to look up such earlier editions as there were in St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, and to my astonishment found that the last of the sentences quoted above was missing from them all. It seemed incredible that the sentence had been first composed in the nineteenth century or that the editor of the 1864 edition would calmly have inserted it without any authority. But at the time I was not able to pursue the mystery.

Recently, Mr George Goyder was showing me his valuable collection of Tudor first editions, and I found he had a copy of the rare 1548 edition of the First Book of Homilies (which was first published in 1547[1]) and also a first edition of the First and Second Books of Homilies (which was published in 1563). When we compared them, we found that the sentence with which I was concerned was in the former all right,[2] but was already missing from the latter. Apparently it was not restored to its place till 1864.

I still do not know why it was ever omitted. J. T. Tomlinson in *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies* (1897), pp. 233 f., says that the Homily on the "Misery of Mankind", which was written by Archdeacon Harpsfield, "was reprinted by Bishop Bonner during the reign of Queen Mary, viz. in 1555". Tomlinson says it is verbatim the same as the Edwardian Homily, except that the texts are quoted in Latin and some significant changes have been made in the second

[1] The short title catalogue lists thirteen editions of the First Book of Homilies between 1547 and 1562, of which no fewer than nine are known to exist in but a single copy.

[2] In this edition the Homily was not divided into two parts, but printed continuously.

part of the Homily, which he proceeds to specify. But Bonner is not the culprit who removed the peacock's feathers, for he reproduces them in this slightly modified form. "Let us look upon our feet, and then down our peacock's feathers, downe proud harte, downe vayne claye, frayle and brittle vessels."

The omission was apparently made in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In Strype's *Parker* (ed. 1821, i. 169) the following statement is made: "In this year (1560) was the first book of Homilies first reprinted containing twelve sermons, after they had been by the Queen's Order diligently looked over and perused by her Divines."

A. R. Vidler.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. B. C. Pawley is Rector of Elland, Yorks, and a Proctor in Convocation.

Dr Hanson is Vicar of Shuttleworth, Lancs.

The Rev. G. Lacey May is the author of *Some Eighteenth-Century Churchmen*, etc.

Dr Kelley is Dean of Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Illinois.

The Rev. F. C. Synge is Warden of St Paul's College, Grahamstown, S. Africa.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE REPAIR OF CHURCHES

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Your October editorial provokes me. I am quite unconvinced that there is anything to be said for calling on the State to keep in repair our places of worship so long as they are used as such. If they are to be preserved as historically interesting monuments to an old order by swingeing the absentee worshipper through Inland Revenue, then let us vacate them and worship in tin sheds or the rectory stables as a witness that we are no longer in that old order, for better or worse. Why not let them fall into vivid ruin speaking volumes to a people that has despised its birthright in this, as in other, respects? Or let the faithful gather the vestigial love of a district for the faith and works of our fathers in the annual bazaar for church funds. Our congregations will work gladly for the church fabric, and in so doing are being edified and the neighbourhood will support their efforts.

Yours faithfully,

M. P. Ralph Bowman.

Ashbrittle.

THE CHURCH AND HOMOSEXUALS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

A recent correspondence in the columns of the *New Statesman and Nation* has exposed not only the anomalies latent in our civil laws for the punishment of homosexual practices, but also a widespread doubt as to the wisdom of any penal measures whatsoever. Yet, although this vexed question must be judged to come within the domain of faith and morals, and so under the judgment of the Church, no Christian comment is to be found. It is with the hope that some Christian restatement of the problem may be evoked that I trust it is neither inappropriate nor untimely for a layman to raise it in your columns: to ask, in fact, what the Christian conscience, acting under the charity and humanity as under the discipline and wisdom of the Church, has to say to the homosexual, who wishes to be an active and healthy member of the Christian community.

I venture to think that this is a pressing pastoral and ethical problem. Is homosexual concubinage to be treated purely and simply as an *unio illicita*, like fornication, and are those who practise it to be judged as "living in sin" and to be deprived of the sacraments of the Church? If so, what are we to say to those who profess to be congenitally homosexual? There are some who say, though this seems to be doubted by some psychiatrists, that the state is incurable: and others who think that it is not the homosexual who needs to be "cured" but those who think he should be. At any rate, there are many who, desiring adjustment and seeking psychiatric and medical treatment, have found no cure: and some of these, who would otherwise be unhappy, neurotic and ineffective members of society, have found not only solace but opportunity for service through accepting what would appear to be their "natural" state. This is no place to assess the contribution of homosexuals to the cultural, social, and even religious well-being of, to mention no others, our European heritage: this is surely indisputable. What is needed is a Christian judgment of our English treatment of the homosexual, dictated as it is by a penal code and a public opinion sadly lagging behind those of our neighbours.

We are still lamentably accustomed to raising this question in hushed and embarrassed tones: if it is raised it is either sidetracked or, to invert a saying of Charles Williams from your columns, "the hungry sheep look up for morals and are given metaphysics". Is it too much to hope that the light and fresh air admitted, perhaps too freely during the last fifty years to the problems of sexual morality in general may be extended during the next fifty, and as soon as possible, to the particular problems of the homosexual? It should be emphasized that a distinctively Christian approach need not be quixotic or romantic: that would rightly be construed as open approval of the relationship and an invitation to licence. Neither need it merely find "gross indecency" where many have found great

beauty. The Christian conscience should distinguish between promiscuity and fidelity, between the balanced union and the vicious perversion—between, in fact, the invert and the pervert: it should then examine both the justice and the expediency of a penal code which, far from curing or deterring the homosexual, has so often led to crime (particularly in the form of blackmail), to bravado, or to the tragedy of wrecked lives.

Yours faithfully,
GRAHAM DOWELL.

49, FROGNAL,
HAMPSTEAD,
LONDON, N.W.3.

MR VICTOR BENNETT AND THE ASSUMPTION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

For reasons explained on p. 39 of my pamphlet "Is the Roman Catholic Church a Secret Society?" I have not known since 1945 whether I am inside or outside the Roman Catholic communion; but, in view of Mr Bennett's postscript on the Assumption in your November number, perhaps I had better say that I wrote to him more than once through the post, in letters which he was (and is) quite free to publish, that I was as puzzled as he was by the untraditional theory of tradition which seemed to be involved in the definition of the Assumption. If ever my own difficulties with the Roman Catholic authorities come to be settled, this new problem of the meaning of tradition will still remain for discussion. I always believed in the Roman Catholic Church as the chief champion of tradition. If she has now repudiated tradition, as she seems to have done in her definition of the Assumption, I do not see myself how Mr Bennett's grounds for leaving her can be challenged by Catholics. It may be that he is more Catholic than Catholics themselves.

My recollection is that I also offered to discuss the question of the meaning of tradition with Catholic defenders of the new theory in *Blackfriars* and other Catholic publications, but that my offer was not accepted.

Yours faithfully,
JOHN V. SIMCOX.

25, FREDERICK STREET,
GRAY'S INN ROAD,
LONDON, W.C. 1.

BOOK REVIEWS

INTERPRETING THE NEW TESTAMENT, 1900–1950. By A. M. Hunter. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

Professor Hunter has already shown himself to be one of those who, although experts, can humble themselves to share the findings of scholarship with the general public; and in this book again he puts

his wide learning at the disposal of the non-specialist reader. His purpose is to give a broad idea of what has been happening in New Testament scholarship during the last half-century in the fields of translation, textual study, research in origins, and theological interpretation, and to do so for the benefit both of specialists in other branches of theology and also of busy ministers and others who cannot keep abreast of specialized studies. As one would expect, the purpose is achieved with lucidity and liveliness, in a book which covers a complicated subject with remarkable firmness of outline and with never a dull page. It is fascinating to see, for instance, what a scholar will pick out as the most significant trends in Johannine studies, or which are the books concerning the life of Christ which he selects for comment, or the six books which in his opinion give the clearest symptoms of the state of theological studies at the present time; and his omissions are perhaps as judicious as his treatment of what he does include is masterly.

If one ventures to express any broad criticisms (apart from several small matters of detail), perhaps it should be said first that the very enthralling closing chapter on the Theology of the New Testament ministers too much comfort to the conservative-minded. It is indeed magnificent that the idea of revelation is being rediscovered, with the essential unity of the Bible, and that the Person of Christ and the Christian Church are coming to occupy the right places in the discussions of scholars; but it would be a pity if readers were led to believe that the relationship between the Old Testament and the New no longer presented problems, or that differences between the various writers of both Testaments had lost their significance. Again, the chapter on the Text of the New Testament suggests a too facile view of the present situation. One would never guess from reading it that the very term "Western Text" is a question-begging one, or divine that the new American-British textual project is no mere continuation of its ill-starred predecessor begun in England. Thirdly, with the harrassed minister in view, it might have been a gain to dispense with most of the German words which, when translated, are unnecessary, and when (as sometimes) not translated, are likely to frustrate rather than help.

But these are small criticisms. In the main, this demonstration that the last fifty years have witnessed real progress in New Testament studies is triumphantly convincing and heartening; and it must command sincere admiration and gratitude.

Clare College,
Cambridge.

C. F. D. Moule.

The Epistle to the Hebrews. By William Manson. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

Professor Manson starts his exposition of *Hebrews* from an unusual angle, St Stephen's defence. He will have nothing to do with the modern theory, associated with the names of Moffatt and E. F. Scott, that the epistle was addressed to Christians of Gentile extrac-

tion, and maintains that it is best understood as dealing with circumstances parallel to those of Stephen. Two sets of Jewish Christians are involved in both cases, one which we might call nationalist, seeing Christ as the fulfilment of the Old Testament and still "sheltering under the eaves of the Holy Place"; and those who saw that "the call to the Church of Jesus was to leave the Temple and all that went with it behind and to go forward". Both Stephen and *Hebrews* are striving to show the first group the inadequacy of their understanding of the Christ. Stephen and *Hebrews* alike have what Dr Manson calls a world-mission Gospel. *Hebrews* is written to "a minority in the Roman Church who in reaction from the larger freedom of the world-mission gospel were asserting principles and counter-claims akin to those of the original 'Hebrew' section in the Christian Church".

The epistle to the Romans and *Hebrews* agree, so Dr Manson maintains, in suggesting that the Roman-Christian community was Jewish (Jewish-Hellenist) in the main, that there was within this community a "Hebrew" minority, and that there was also an "observing Gentile-Christian section". Personally I felt a sense of relief in reading this book. Often studies of the history of the early Church leave one with a feeling of an awkward gap: there is first the Jewish Church, and then the conflict between the "liberal" and "conservative" groups therein—and then suddenly it has become a Gentile Church. But in fact it didn't become, and never has become, a Gentile Church: it remains what Stephen and *Hebrews* maintain that it always was—a Jewish, a Christian, an outward-going Church.

The actual form of the book consists of a demonstration of his thesis. But there is never any suspicion that the author is juggling with *Hebrews* in order to make it support him. He is careful to say that this passage or that does not by itself prove his contention. His exposition is careful and untendentious, and even if one does not agree with the main thesis one benefits from his guidance. It is an advantage that he does not work his way straight through the epistle. In chapter 3 he deals with "The admonitory sections of the epistle. The eschatological life"; in chapter 4 with "The Person and Office of the Redeemer"; and in chapter 5 with "The Oblation of the Body of Christ".

There are points with which one may disagree, but Dr Manson has made a real contribution to the understanding of *Hebrews*.

GRAHAMSTOWN. F. C. SYNGE.

GORHAM AND THE BISHOP OF EXETER. By J. C. S. Nias. S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

This book recalls a controversy which shook the Church of England one hundred years ago. The protagonists were a legally minded bishop—Phillpots of Exeter—and a scholarly priest—G. C. Gorham —whose views on baptism were held by the bishop to be contrary to the teaching of the Church of England. The bishop refused to

institute him to the living of Brampford Speke, near Exeter, until Mr Gorham had submitted himself to a public examination as to the soundness of his doctrinal views. The file of every diocesan bishop must contain many potential "Gorham" cases which have never flared up into a public blaze. This time neither of the men would give way. Mr Gorham was questioned and cross-examined by the bishop for upwards of fifty hours during seven days. At the end of this exhausting examination the bishop refused to institute. Later the Court of Arches upheld the bishop. Gorham appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and on March 8, 1850, the judgment of the Court was reversed. Gorham was instituted under *fiat* of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Mr Nias, whose study of the case has led him to believe there is something in what Gorham had to say, sets forth in quotations from the original documents the main arguments on either side, and describes the high-lights at each stage of the controversy; the question and answer of bishop and priest; the case for Mr Gorham; the first judgment of the Court of Arches; the bishop's case before the Privy Council, and the final judgment. It is also a record of the nation-wide reverberations and the many pamphlets and other writings which arose from the case, referring among other matters to the reasons which propelled Archdeacon Manning into the Church of Rome and those which kept Dr Pusey in the Church of England. The book concludes with a brief reconsideration of the case. This section, apart from a valuable reference to the teaching of F. D. Maurice on baptism, is the least satisfactory part of the book. This may not be altogether a bad thing: it compels the reader to think out, if not to write out, his own reconsideration of the questions of baptism which, in a somewhat different form, are still very much before the Church.

It is not possible in a few sentences to sum up the main arguments of the Gorham case. One brief quotation in Gorham's own words must here suffice. "Our Church holds, and I hold, that no grace is conveyed in baptism except to *worthy recipients*; and infants . . . cannot receive any benefits from baptism except there shall have been a prevenient act of grace to make them worthy. . . ." (p. 18). This quotation, incomplete as it is, states the main issue sharply: "Is baptismal grace confined to the act of baptism or not? The bishop contended that it is, Gorham said 'No'."

The reconsiderations arising from this book would indicate that both bishop and priest were contending for an important aspect of truth: both to that extent were right, but neither held the whole truth. The truth itself is larger than either of them was able to see. It is fortunate for the Church of England that Gorham was upheld. The bishop's case would have closed the door; Gorham's case left the door open for reconciliation and comprehension. It is the typical way of Anglicanism.

This study provides us with a necessary warning. It shows the utter futility of attempting to settle questions of orthodoxy by cross-questioning on the meaning of texts and words, by the impersonal

logic of argument, or by the judgment of a court of law. The truth and the grace of God will not be tied down by these forms of human procedure.

Dalton Holme, Beverley. Henry Hullen.

Florence Allshorn and the Story of St Julian's. By J. H. Oldham. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

In the centre of this book is an all-too-brief apologia for the last of Miss Allshorn's spiritual adventures, continued after her death by the friends who gathered round her. Of this she was herself the author; Dr Oldham's part has been limited to the final corrections. He has added before and after a biographical introduction and a "retrospect and prospect", united to the centre-piece by his many quotations from Miss Allshorn's letters, and from letters to him from her friends. The result is something quite unique, which is very hard to review.

The record is of a religious vocation arising out of an Evangelical background and developing in complete loyalty to the Evangelical tradition through a lifetime of service spent in close association with the C.M.S. Yet certain classical features familiar in quite other contexts emerge the more startlingly, in a young girl saying, "I've just done a bad thing, and whenever I behave like that again I'm going to wear my very oldest shoes as a punishment"; in a young missionary sent, almost without preliminary training, to Busoga. "Perhaps nowhere else in Uganda is this psychic pressure of evil to be felt in anything like the same degree", wrote Bishop Gresford Jones in another book, quoted here. Told that she must undergo an immediate operation for tuberculosis, "something came to her in the train", and she went to Switzerland instead. During her time of recovery she was to live with a strange colony of highly unconventional people, most of them without religion, who were charmed by her while she felt their charm. Selected to fill a gap in the training of women missionaries for the C.M.S. until the end of a term, she became a great missionary educator. A memorandum of hers on training in this period is a clue to the next: she wrote

> That every recruit has a true and effective spiritual life is taken too much for granted, and we have a queer belief that the Holy Spirit will do the job for us if we ask, occasionally in some little ardent way, and hundreds of times coldly. But the grace and power of the Holy Spirit, let us make no mistake about it, offered with its divine generosity as it is, is only half the story; to be able to accept it we must have learned from God how to purify the will, we must have learned the lesson of detachment from the self-will and its proprietorships. The one is given as the other is learned; therefore we do not want secular colleges with a religious bias, pushing in knowledge of theology, anthropology, Bible, etc., as if they were matters to be learned like Maths. For the second stage of training at all events we want a religious house (with its connotation) for the training—not a religious house divorced from the world of sinners and worldly men, but a community of people struggling to become God-possessed, where they will find the world too as well as the deeper commitments of God.

How this was worked out is the story of the last ten years of her life. She began with a practical problem of "essentials of missionary training", having in mind especially the continuation of training and spiritual refreshment after the first tour. In preparing a place for this she and the friends who came with her—"We were people of our generation and had few disciplines and obediences"—found themselves again where she had been years before in Busoga, in the footsteps of the fathers of the desert, struggling with the spirit that divides. A new kind of community came into being, with many features that may puzzle, challenge, shock those of another tradition. And a life-story was perfected which conforms, as lives of the saints do, in a strange way to the actual pattern of the life of Christ. It was finished in 1950, but St Julian's is still with us, a spiritual home for other people besides missionaries on their first furlough.

KELHAM. GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE SHORTER OXFORD BIBLE. Abridged and edited by G. W. Briggs, G. B. Caird, and N. Micklem. O.U.P. 7s. 6d. (also school edition 6s.).

This book arises in part from a desire to print at least some of the Bible in a small volume and reasonable type, particularly for school use. The question is inevitably raised whether it is possible to teach the Bible effectively in such truncated form: on the purely mechanical level, a child can learn to find his way about the Bible only with a whole Bible. It is doubtful whether any shortened Bibles have really proved their worth in the classroom. At the same time, such a book, well done, may well be a useful guide to a teacher or private reader, and this one is certainly well done.

The simple title is perhaps inaccurate: it is not only a considerable abridgment, but also a considerable rearrangement of the Bible. It might be described as a source-book of Christian teaching, for there is an admirably clear insistence throughout on the Bible as the story of God's people, whose faith eventually finds expression in the Church creeds. In the New Testament, after sections devoted to our Lord's life, his teaching, and the Acts of the Apostles, come passages from the Epistles arranged under the headings of the Christian way of life, and the Christian faith (under the clauses of the Apostles' Creed). The Old Testament selections are more or less in chronological order with the law books in their historical settings, and with useful additions from the Apocrypha. It seems a pity that the principle was not carried further, and the Prophets put in their setting in the histories, and likewise Paul's letters against the background of Acts, and perhaps the Gospels against the background of the Apostolic kerygma; for the one serious criticism of the selection would be a general lack of context, particularly in the New Testa-

ment. There are good introductory notes and a useful, unpretentious syllabus for Bible teaching in schools: it is a pity there is no index of Biblical passages.

TOTTENHAM. J. H. CHURCHILL.

THE EARLY CHURCH AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Irene Allen. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

This is a disappointing book. It is designed to meet a genuine need of students in training colleges and grammar schools by approaching the New Testament on sound lines, through St Paul and the Acts to the Gospels. The actual structure of the book, however, is unworthy of the design. A book of this compass must be summary in its conclusions, but Miss Allen adopts solutions, sometimes less likely ones, to critical problems in some cases without a hint of her reasons, and when they do appear, they show the all too familiar arbitrariness of liberalism. Training college students and sixth formers deserve more serious criticism than this, and can learn much from it; more particularly they need a better appreciation of the theology of the New Testament books than this book gives, but without which it is difficult to understand the existence of the early Church, let alone the New Testament.

TOTTENHAM. J. H. CHURCHILL.

KIERKEGAARD THE CRIPPLE. By Theodor Haecker. Harvill Press. 5s.

If this book had been called "The Intelligent Catholic's Guide to Kierkegaard" the reader might have an idea of what to expect; for it is written by a Roman Catholic, and his contentions would hold true only for someone who himself was of that persuasion.

Although it assumes that Kierkegaard was a neurotic, and being a humpback cripple had certain psychological presuppositions, it is nevertheless a critque of certain aspects of his thought. It is not surprising, therefore, that he is judged from the standpoint of St Thomas Aquinas.

In one breath, so to speak, the writer regrets that Kierkegaard is not a philosopher and metaphysician after the manner of the Angelic Doctor (pp. 10–13), and then goes on to attack his concept of "The Absurd" on philosophical grounds (pp. 14–16). Surely it is just possible that Kierkegaard, who was forced to use the terminology of the speculative philosophy of his day, and who expressly repudiated philosophy, might be investing the word with a different shade of meaning. (The Concept of Dread is another example of the same process.)

According to Haecker, any intuition which may have led Kierkegaard to see things in a "true" way was in the nature of *scientia*. Not being a member of "the infallible Church", he could not be expected to possess *fides*. Only a man with *fides*, for example, would be able to deduce from Kierkegaard's statement that man is feminine

in his relation to God, that "that is why Mary is Queen of Creation and all its angels and saints" (p. 19).

What of the hump, which must have had a certain influence on his spiritual life—although, of course, the physical may only *influence* the spiritual side of man, not *create* it (p. 47)? Had it something to do with his not turning to the "unalloyed perfection and purity of the true doctrine" as Cardinal Newman did about the same period (p. 20)? Who knows?

Glasgow. R. M. McGregor.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism. By John C. Bowmer. With four plates. Dacre Press: Adam and Charles Black. 25s.

Within the apse of Wesley's Chapel, City Road, London, is an interesting piece of carving on the pediment of the memorial to John Wesley. The sculptor is unknown, but his insight was greater than many an author who has assayed to characterize Wesley. In the centre of the carving is a globe, for the world was John Wesley's parish. The herald's trumpet and the shepherd's crook protrude from behind the world, for in Wesley the preacher and pastor were inextricably combined. The world is held in its place by two books, and as one would expect one of them is the Bible. It is a surprise to many that the other is the Liturgy of the Church of England.

In this work of careful scholarship well and interestingly presented, the author has shown that, not only was Wesley himself a devout and loving user of the traditional Means of Grace, but that eighteenth-century Methodism was much more of a sacramental revival than has sometimes been recognized. A careful study of Wesley's *Journal* reveals that throughout over fifty years of evangelistic revival Wesley communicated at the Lord's Table more than twice a week. His sermons taught *The Duty of Constant Communion* and his own practise illustrated this sermon, which was first written for his Oxford students in 1733 and reprinted for the Methodist congregations in 1788. There was much more concern for the observance of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism than is frequently realized, and this book brings many interesting and important facts to our notice which outdate Niebuhr's rather facile comment on Methodism as a "belated, pietistic, evangelistic sect of the eighteenth century". Father Maximum Piette was nearer the mark in recognizing Methodism as a revival of catholic evangelism. The twentieth century has still much to learn from a movement of the Spirit which was, in its origin, a revival of worship as well as evangelism. The adequate appraisal of the Wesleys has yet to be written, but when it is, the author will have to include facts elucidated in this book if he is to avoid caricature.

Wesley's Chapel, London. Ronald V. Spivey.

WHERE SCIENCE AND RELIGION MEET. By L. E. Browne. Religious Education Press. 6s.

This book attempts to deal with some of the vexatious disputes between the scientific and the religious approaches to reality. The religious aspect of things is often well expressed; but unfortunately the argument as a whole is vitiated by special pleading. On p. 8, for example, we are told first that "there are . . . various experiences . . . such as the affection of a mother for her child . . . which do not seem *at present* to come within the scope of scientific knowledge"; and a few lines later that "such experiences as these seem to be like religious experiences in not being *susceptible* to scientific investigation". It is a pity that religious interpreters of science are sometimes so excessively eager to prove their case. (My italics.)

The problem of miracles similarly is begged. On p. 15 we read that "divergences from the laws of Nature . . . are not observed", but on p. 21 that the Resurrection was not "a breach of God's laws. Rather it was the first example of the new law of life". The relation between this "new law of life" and the scientific "laws of nature" is not elucidated.

The basic weakness lies perhaps in an inadequate conception of science, as "the systematized study of the things we experience with our five senses". This must make the object of the book almost impossible to achieve.

EXETER. K. G. COLLIER.

NATURAL SCIENCE AND THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By John Baillie. Oxford University Press. 5s.

This little book contains more wisdom than many a large volume on the same subject. The discussion revolves round the distinction between efficient and final causes, starting with Socrates' account of the "causes" of his accepting his sentence, and passing via Bacon and Descartes to Whitehead, von Hügel, and Mr Michael Foster. Prof. Baillie's argument is roughly the following. The interpretation of the world in terms of efficient causes is a perfectly legitimate approach, but it depends for its pursuit on a conception of the universe, first as rational and intelligible, and second as not predictable from a knowledge of its purposes. Neither the ancient nor the medieval world were able to disengage themselves from a picture of nature as peopled with demons or infused with divinity; the release from these assumptions followed only after the Christian doctrines of the rationality of God and the contingency of nature. (Prof. Baillie might have added that the change of outlook developed only as men became emancipated from the direct dependence on nature of a peasant society, and assimilated their experience of the increasing control over nature of a bourgeois society.) Bacon and Descartes insisted that the study of efficient causes in nature was not to displace the appreciation of the final cause of the whole. In fact, scientific study can flourish only when men hold certain values as absolute. On the other hand, the long slow discipline of submission

to the iron laws of nature makes in itself an essential contribution to a mature spiritual life.

Prof. Baillie writes with charm and simplicity, and has clarified an important aspect of the subject. Only on one point do I feel there is need of correction: when he asserts that "science itself produces no outlook on life". It is true that judgments of value "cannot by any magic be spirited out of (science's) own observation of facts"; yet it remains also true that when a man finds all the sanctions for his values undermined, the *experience* of scientific practice may lead him to extend his principles of scientific doubt, tolerance, impartiality, and so on, into a general philosophy of life. The power of fresh experience to remould a man's outlook *when the sanctions for his inherited code are shaken* is perhaps not easily appreciated by those whose code is secure.

EXETER. K. G. COLLIER.

THE JEWISH MISSION. By Ignaz Maybaum. James Clarke and Co. 10s. 6d.

This is not the first book in English from the pen of Dr Maybaum, and readers of his previous works will expect something of interest and importance. They will not be disappointed, even if, Jew and Gentile alike, they may sometimes find themselves in disagreement with the writer's standpoint.

What is the Jewish mission? What has been the contribution of Jewry to civilization down the ages? What, in fact, truly deserves the attribute "Jewish"? What is the relation of Judaism to Zionism, of religion to politics? These and other related questions, of significance to Christian as well as to Jew, are faced in this book. The answers given are clearly presented from the angle of Progressive Judaism by one who firmly believes this to be the solution of the problems now confronting his co-religionists. The "Notes for the Christian Reader" at the end of the volume suggest that this is a kind of Jewish apologia, but it is evident from the book as a whole that, illuminating and stimulating as the reading is to the non-Jew, it is to the Jew primarily that it is addressed.

The final chapter, entitled "Mission and Election", makes very clear both the message and the motive of the author. It is to urge us all to think out again what Maritain has called the "Mystery of Israel". And in emphasizing "God's glory in Israel which is God's glory alone" Dr Maybaum is suggesting the right and proper approach to this whole consideration for both Jews and Christians. It is the study of all the implications of the mission of God's elect to witness to the divine truth, the divine purposes, the divine certainty. The God who has chosen us also sends us, and though the acceptance of this election and mission may mean suffering, it also brings hope, and certainly ends in blessing.

C. WITTON-DAVIES.

ST DAVIDS.

THE MESSIANIC HOPE IN ITS HISTORICAL SETTING. By Laurence E. Browne. S.P.C.K. 3s.

Professor L. E. Browne's seven chapters on the Messianic Hope were first delivered as lectures to the students of King Alfred's College, Winchester. The S.P.C.K. is to be thanked for allowing a wider public the opportunity of reading such a stimulating study of so important a subject. Probably no other question of the many raised by historical theology is so prejudiced in the minds of modern readers by preconceived ideas. What precisely were the hopes of Old Testament days with regard to the future? How far were these hopes fulfilled in the New Testament? Why have the Jews rejected the Messiahship of Jesus? These questions must be answered honestly, and independently of all presuppositions, and it is in order to enable the serious reader to achieve this that Dr Browne invites us to join him "in a voyage of exploration through the Old Testament and other Jewish writings that we may study the facts for ourselves".

In the course of less than sixty pages we cannot expect anything in the nature of an exhaustive treatment of so central a concern. But beginning from the period of Jeremiah and Ezekiel at the outset of the sixth century B.C., we are shown how "it was only when kings had ceased to reign in Jerusalem that men began to set their hope on a new shoot arising from the old line, a king who would secure peace and prosperity". A good deal of space is given to the prophecies of "Second Isaiah", and in particular to the so-called "servant poems", which are wisely described as "eternal words of a prophet" and so belonging "to the eternal Son of God". Attention is also paid to the post-exilic "age of disillusionment", to the apocalyptic literature of Daniel, and to the apocryphal books of Jubilees, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the books of Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon. And the Christian reader is urged finally to think out for himself what would have happened "if our Lord had openly declared himself to be the Messiah . . .".

C. WITTON-DAVIES.

ST DAVIDS.

PRAYERS FOR SCHOOL, CHURCH, AND HOME. Compiled by T. Grigg-Smith. Grosvenor Press; obtainable S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This book deserves to be well known and well used. It first appeared in 1921 with a commendation by William Temple, and its reappearance, revised, enlarged, and at a not unreasonable price, should be a help to many who are anxious to bring into school and private prayers the right thing, on the right occasion, and in the right words. The prayers chosen are never juvenile or trivial, and the book should be of real value both to those responsible for the opening services at junior day schools and to housemasters at public schools. It will appeal to those of all denominations who dislike both the precious and the ponderous in their prayers, but who, having an

ear for the riches and music of the past, would go some way with Matthew Green in his dislike of those

> Who their ill-tasted, home-brewed prayer
> To the State's mellow forms prefer.

WELLINGTON COLLEGE. W. D. DINNIS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH: W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline* (Notice and Translation) ($2.00).

BRITONS PUBLISHING SOCIETY: Jubelum, *Freemasonry and the Church of England Reconciled, or the Apologia of a Craft Conscious Bishop* (1s.).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA: *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan* (1s.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: G. R. Balleine, *A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England* (12s. 6d.).

CLONMORE AND REYNOLDS: J. Heneghan, *The Secret Scripture of the Poor* (7s. 6d.).

FRIENDS OF LINCOLN CATHEDRAL: J. H. Srawley, *The Origin and Growth of Cathedral Foundations as illustrated by the Cathedral Church of Lincoln* (second edition, revised) (2s. 6d.); J. H. Srawley, *Michael Honywood, Dean of Lincoln, 1660–81: a story of the English Church in critical times* (2s.); C. J. P. Cave, *Lincoln Roof Bosses* (2s. 6d.); R. M. T. Hill, *Olive Sutton* (2s.); J. H. Srawley, *The Book of John de Scalby* (1s. 6d.).

HEFFER: L. E. Browne, *From Babylon to Bethlehem* (6s.).

LONGMANS: G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (35s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: F. W. Dillistone, *The Structure of the Divine Society* (16s.).

MOWBRAY: R. M. Benson, *Instructions on the Religious Life* (10s. 6d.); Lindsay Dewar, *The Moral Conduct of a Christian* (7s. 6d.).

JOHN MURRAY: A. V. Baillie, *My First Eighty Years* (21s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Sir Walter Moberly, *Responsibility* (Riddell Memorial Lectures) (5s.).

PATERNOSTER PUBLICATIONS: Douglas Hyde, *The Answer to Communism* (Revised edition: 5s.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: P. Hall, *The Book Adventurous* (4s. 6d.); E. H. Hayes (Ed.), *Christian Youth Manuals* (n.p.).

S.C.M. PRESS: *The Church* (3s. 6d.); Alan Richardson and Wolfgang Schweitzer (Editors), *Biblical Authority for Today* (18s.); Walther Eichrodt, *Man in the Old Testament* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: J. R. Jameson, *Home Prayers* (2s. 6d.); A. E. Welsford, *Life in the Early Church* (15s. cloth; 12s. paper in 2 vols.); F. A. Smalley, *Too Little —Too Late?* (10d.).

STUDENT CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF GREECE (ATHENS): Paulus—Hellas—*Oikumene* (An Ecumenical Symposium on the 1,700th Anniversary of the Coming of St Paul to Greece) (n.p.).

TYNDALE PRESS: D. W. B. Robinson, *Josiah's Reform and the Book of the Law* (2s.); J. C. Pollock, *Pioneers* (2s.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZÜRICH): Joachim Bieneck, *Sohn Gottes als Christus-bezeichnung der Synoptiker* (Fr. 6.25).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher